

3-3-1999

CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 03/03/1999

Marsha Brandt

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes>

Recommended Citation

Brandt, Marsha, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 03/03/1999" (1999). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 558.
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/558>

This Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the CWU Faculty Senate Archive at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact pingfu@cwu.edu.

MINUTES

CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES: March 3, 1999

<http://www.cwu.edu/~fsenate>

Presiding Officer: John Alsoszatai-Petheo

Recording Secretary: Marsha Brandt

Meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Senators: All Senators or their Alternates were present except Adamson, Soliz

Visitors: Liahna Babener, Phil Backlund, David Dauwalder, Lin Douglas, Barney Erickson, Josh Kilen, John Lasik, Charles McGehee, Jack McKay, John Ninnemann, Don Nixon (SeaTac), Robert Perkins, Connie Roberts, Roy Savoian, Libby Street, Warren Street, Carolyn Wells

CHANGES TO AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA: MOTION NO. 3200 (Passed) Morris Uebelacker moved and Ken Gamon seconded a motion to approve the agenda as distributed.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the February 17, 1999, Faculty Senate meeting were approved as changed: Add: "2/17/99" after FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES: and Delete: "Beverly Heckart" from Visitors: (Professor Heckart was attending as alternate to Senator Ngalamulume)

COMMUNICATIONS: (Available for viewing in the Senate Office or distribution on request)

Beverly Heckart: AAUP Red Book (Copies available in President's Office, Board of Trustees, Senate Office, Library Reference, all Dean's Offices)

Thomas Blanton: 2/05/99, Re: Presidential Search Process

John Ressler: 3/03/99, Re: Presidential Search Process

M. Meghan Miller: 2/11/99, Re: Out-of-context Reporting of Top Salaries

Roy Savoian: 3/01/99, Re: University Forum--Core Values: The Next Step
(Requested to be read into the minutes)

"The Core Values enumerated herein represent essential and enduring tenets of CWU. They are so fundamental and deeply held that they seldom change, if ever. This quality of "timelessness" engenders a small set of guiding principles and ideals that are internal to the institution and independent of the external environment. They define who we are and what we stand for. We must be ever vigilant to ensure that CWU's Core Values serve as a screen through which major decisions are passed and a test of how we conduct ourselves.

- The students' highest good is our paramount concern
- Build student expertise through exploration and application, based on a liberal arts and sciences foundation
- Dedication to quality teaching, with faculty as primary arbiters of the curriculum
- Create a climate of intellectual openness, inquiry and sharing of ideas
- Foster a lifelong aspiration for knowledge; developing a capacity to attain knowledge
- Stewardship by everyone of academic, human, physical and fiscal resources
- Community that is both supportive and challenging
- Nurture a recognition of and respect for the diversity of the world

REPORTS:

A. ACTION ITEMS:

CHAIR:

Election of 1999/00 Faculty Senate Executive Committee

MOTION NO. 3201 (Passed) Chair Elect: Terry DeVietti, Psychology

MOTION NO. 3202 (Passed) Secretary: Lynn Richmond, Business Administration

MOTION NO. 3203 (Passed) Chair: Linda Beath, Curriculum & Supervision

Bill Benson moved and Alberta Thyfault seconded a motion to confirm Linda Beath as Chair.

The following individuals were nominated to the position of At-Large Member: Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies; Ken Gamon, Mathematics; and Joshua Nelson, Foreign Languages. Ballots were distributed to Senators and they were instructed to vote for two individuals; the nominees receiving the highest plurality of votes will become the two at large members of the Executive Committee.

MOTION NO. 3204 (Passed)

Chair Alsoszatai-Petheo moved that the Faculty Senate accept the following results for the positions of At-Large Members, as calculated by and of the 1998/99 Senate Executive Committee: At-Large Member: Marla Wyatt Family & Consumer Studies and At-Large Member: Ken Gamon, Mathematics

1999/00 Faculty Senate Executive Committee Membership (effective 6/15/99)

CHAIR: Linda Beath, Curriculum & Supervision
CHAIR ELECT: Terry DeVietti, Psychology
SECRETARY: Lynn Richmond, Business Administration
AT-LARGE MEMBER: Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies
AT-LARGE MEMBER: Ken Gamon, Mathematics
PAST CHAIR: John Alsoszatai-Petheo, Anthropology

Code Committee: Beverly Heckart moved approval of the following statement:

MOTION NO. 3205

"The Faculty Senate accepts the principle of proration of faculty salaries on the basis of enrollment for summer session, 1999. It directs the Senate Code Committee to prepare a code amendment inserting the right of the administration to devise such prorating policies as a permanent feature of summer school."

MOTION AMENDMENT NO. 3205A (Passed by Roll Call Vote)

Todd Schaefer moved and Ken Gamon seconded a motion to amend Motion #3205 as follows:

Aye: 26 (Blackett, Bullock, Cocheba, D'Acquisto, Ely, Beath, Gamon, Gray, Gunn, Hawkins, Kaminski, Bach, Michel, Monson, Mustain, Nelson, Ownes, Caples, Bradley, Salcedo, Schaefer, Schwing, Gause, Thyfault, Uebelacker, Wilson)
Nay: 9 (Beaghan, Benson, Braunstein, Brodersen, DeVietti, Fordan, Stacy, Williams, Wyatt)
Abstain: 2 (Raubeson, Heckart)

"The Faculty Senate accepts the principle of proration of faculty salary on the basis of enrollment for summer session, 1999. It directs the Senate Code Committee to prepare a code amendment ~~inserting the right of requiring the administration to devise such prorating policies as a permanent feature of summer school~~ prepare a proration plan for summer school to be submitted to the Faculty Senate for approval before it can be implemented."

Vote was held on **MOTION NO. 3205**, motion **FAILED** by **ROLL CALL VOTE** as amended by **MOTION AMENDMENT NO 3205A** as follows:

MOTION NO. 3205B: (Failed)

Linda Beath requested a ballot vote to supersede the roll call vote.

Aye: 13 (Blackett, Brodersen, Cocheba, D'Acquisto, Ely, Beath, Fordan, Monson, Mustain, Ownes, Schwing, Thyfault, Wilson)

Nay: 16 (Raubeson, Beaghan, Benson, Braunstein, Bullock, DeVietti, Gray, Hawkins, Michel, Heckart, Schaefer, Gause, Stacy, Uebelacker, Williams, Wyatt)

Abstain: 6 (Gamon, Bach, Nelson, Caples, Bradley, Salcedo)

Dauwalder: Referring to the two-part motion, the Provost, commented that the deans will be presenting information regarding the development of the proration policies in the colleges, the extent of their past application and the effect of their presence. He encouraged the Senate's support of the policies, stating that each was developed through college-based policy development processes. They were presented based on provision 15.40 of the Faculty Code: "The provisions of this Faculty Code shall apply to Summer Session unless Summer Session funding circumstances warrant exceptions." Summer session circumstances are different from academic year. It operates on a quasi self-support basis. They have worked hard the past few years to achieve the dual goals of delivering educational opportunities and returning revenues to the colleges and academic departments. The majority of the funding returning to academic units is used to support faculty in their efforts to benefit students. A yearly fund of \$100,000 from summer funds is earmarked to give to the Faculty Senate for faculty development.

The three colleges and the school presented their responses to the questions as follows:

Discussion: (The hour-long discussion is on tape in the Senate Office and will be available through Spring Quarter):

School of Business and Economics (handout available in Faculty Senate Office):

Question: Is SBE proration pooled if enrollment falls below a certain level?

Lasik: Yes, the focal point is the school level. If the entire school surpasses break-even, the full schedule proceeds as published.

Heckart: So SBE doesn't start summer session saying we want to make so much profit. What you do is start the summer session and say we want to break even and any revenues that show up as profit are serindipindous.

Lasik: Yes, if we had to identify the objective in running summer school, it's to maximize employment opportunities for the faculty in line with program needs.

Question: When was the last time SBE prorated?

Lasik: Summer of 1993.

College of Education and Professional Studies

(handout available in Faculty Senate Office):

McKay: Any non-proration would have a chilling effect on any incentive nor entrepreneurship or creativity to enhance summer school offerings. CEPS has not prorated during the past years. It has either adjusted the schedule or filled it with faculty whose classes were cancelled with faculty who were reassigned to classes that may have been originally assigned in the schedule to the adjunct or staff. It is felt that a "no cut" policy would be a disincentive to do anything creatively or to experiment or promote special education, special workshops within the college.

Heckart: From the summer school budget proposal, it is noted that CEPS made a profit of \$332,000 in 1998/99. So on the basis of the percentage of cancelled classes which was 3.6%, you would lose 3.6% of \$332,000? However, since you do not prorate, you wouldn't lose any money.

College of Arts & Humanities(handout available in Faculty Senate Office):

- Backlund: The presence of the policy allows better planning which keeps the numbers of courses prorated down. In the summer of 1997, one course was prorated and the average proration of that one person was at 50% of their salary. In 1998, eight courses were prorated and the average was at 65.4% with an average reduction of \$1206. If there were no proration, it would be difficult to extrapolate revenue. On the expense side, expenses would have been increased by \$9600 in 1997, and by \$30,357 in 1998 which would have been offset by some revenue.
- Benson: Do you find nothing unethical about charging summer students excessive tuition to fund year-around students during the regular year?
- Backlund: The summer fees are the same, the tuition rate is the same as during the school year.
- Benson: But the money is not being spent right in the summer.
- Backlund: That is correct.
- Benson: In other words, we would be able to lower tuition in the summer if we didn't want to extract a profit. So the summer school student is being called upon to subsidize your particular programs during the regular year.
- Backlund: If we wanted to just cover expenses, yes, then the summer session tuition would be lower.
- Heckart: The profits for summer 1998 were a little over \$85,000. Give or take a few thousand dollars, the profits would have been diminished to about \$55,000 or maybe \$60,000.
- Backlund: Probably.
- Dauwalder: There are a large number of other infrastructure costs (lease costs, facility costs, maintenance costs, other costs) of keeping the university in its various locations open throughout the summer that are essentially not charged against the summer budget. That is why the term "Quasi" self-support is used, because it truly is not a self-support operation. Within our system, there are a variety of tradeoffs in both directions. We don't charge students directly for many of those costs throughout the summer.
- Benson: Nor has the legislature seen it. My fear is that they will begin to do what we are doing internally -- to charge these particular costs in a lot. We are financed for the entire year. This particular set of precedents of costing these particular things, I think is endangering that particular process as well.
- Comment: A senator commented that 80% of the courses he taught in the summer have been prorated. The same enrollment minimums (twelve students per course) should not be used in the summer as we do not have the same enrollment. Few if any of the courses he taught even approached twelve. And yet in his department there was no distinction between courses essential to the program and courses which represented creative efforts on the part of the faculty -- they were prorated alike. Also, he commented that faculty development (equipment purchases) is laudable. However, those expenditures should not be funded at the expense of faculty. Also, the administration has been criticized for diminishing the salary pool by using salary savings to put a computer on every faculty members desk. This is a parallel issue. The principle is the same.

College of the Sciences(handout available in Faculty Senate Office):

History of Faculty Code Section 15.40 (1986)

- Erickson: 1986 was the year we switched from state support to self support. When the self-support issue came, funding then became the issue. Prior to that we were given an allocation from the state and we lived within it.
- Heckart: The great fear was that we would not break even. And the great fear that prompted this was that we might go in the hole.

- Question: Was it created with proration in mind?
- Erickson: I don't think it was created with proration in mind. Proration at that time was a piece of the action. It was something that had been going on for thirty years. It was strictly because of the move from a state-support system to self-support system. This was a safety valve.
- Benson: I was Summer Session Director at the time and I remember that at the time proration was really up to the deans. Even when we went to self-support, we did have in the background a necessity to make money that was then transferred to the general fund. We had risks. If we didn't make our tuition, we were vulnerable for having to pay out of our more generally yearly funds back to that particular general fund.
- Dauwalder: We have a Summer Session Policy Section in the University Policy Manual 5-7.6 "Faculty salaries may be adjusted by mutual agreement if minimum course enrollment standards are not met...."
- Heckart: Everyone talks about the prorations that have been going on for about thirty years as a policy. Really it wasn't. It was a kind of an administrative device to get around the danger the risk of cancelling classes. What is new within the last two to three years is that schools have developed policies for application across the board. What used to happen was that mutual agreement between deans and faculty members to avoid cancellation. The danger of cancellation always existed. The other thing is that we used to be afraid that we would lose money, now we are afraid of not making a profit.
- Cocheba: I think it's clear that this is not a perfect system in handling our summer school budget. I also think it can be improved and I think I hear Provost Dauwalder saying that he wants further input for the improvements. There is uncertainty both for students and faculty -- uncertainty for faculty planning concerning income and looking for alternatives for summer; uncertainty for students concerning whether or not they'll have a class that they really want. I think it's a problem that we have relatively low salaries among some faculty and they really need this supplemental income during the summer. We need to recognize this and address it. Inequalities: I would prefer to take a prorated teaching opportunity than have no opportunity. On the positive side, this obviously offers flexibility and at the level it should be offered (at the dean's level). One of the major attributes of this proration is that it encourages better planning. We should be offering what students want, not what faculty want. The thing that bothers me most about not passing this motion is that we have nothing in place (no recommendation) for what would replace it.
- Benson: Under the Faculty Code we do have a policy which basically does not support prorating salaries for faculty during summer school. The only thing it does support is prorating loads. Secondly, when I talk about inequality, I think the policies that are coming out of the dean's offices basically reflect inequalities in terms of whether or not the risk is going to be born solely by the individual or by the school. The point should be made very clear that the money being made by the university is well in excess of paying for all the classes so that there are no disappointed students, there are no faculty at risk.

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE:

MOTION TO TABLE NO. 3206 (Passed)

Linda Beath moved and Luetta Monson seconded a motion to table the approval of the Mission Statement and Learning Objectives of the General Education Program at Central Washington University until the April 14, 1999, Senate meeting.

B. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

1. CHAIR

Chair Alsoszatai-Petheo shared a memorandum from Provost Dauwalder to the Academic Affairs Council, dated March 2, 1999, Re: Proposed Development of a Plan to Address Ongoing Faculty Salary Concerns (AKA B Faculty Salary Management Plan). He welcomed any inputs.

2. CHAIR ELECT:

MOTION NO. 3207: (Passed)

Linda Beath moved and Ken Gamon seconded the following Senate Resolution:

The Faculty Senate directs John A. Alsoszatai-Petheo, Faculty Senate Chair, to report to the Central Washington University Board of Trustees at its Friday, March 5th, 1999, meeting that the faculty Senate concurs, and supports the Resolution adopted by the Concerned Faculty of Central which states:

A We, the undersigned faculty of CWU, insist that faculty constitute a majority of the upcoming Presidential search committee. We also insist that faculty representation on the committee be determined by faculty."

3. PRESIDENT: In the interests of time, the President decided to forego his report.

4. SENATE CONCERNS: In the interests of time, the Senate decided to forego its concerns.

STUDENT REPORT:

Robert Blackett briefly reminded the Senate that the standardized syllabi will be submitted to the Academic Affairs Committee March 4, 1999. He encouraged the senators to give it positive action when it comes to the Senate floor.

5. FACULTY SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS:

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - No Report

BUDGET COMMITTEE

In the interests of time, Barney Erickson decided to forego his report.

CODE COMMITTEE - No Report

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE - No Report

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE -

Jim Hawkins reported that the Personnel Committee has completed the draft regarding part-time issues and will be meeting with the Code Committee and representatives of part-time faculty to finalize the issue and bring it to the Senate.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - No Report

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

*****NEXT REGULAR FACULTY SENATE MEETING: April 14, 1999**

BARGE 412

AGENDA

FACULTY SENATE REGULAR MEETING

3:10 p.m., Wednesday, March 3, 1999

BARGE 412

INTERACTIVE CONNECTION: SEATAC

- I. ROLL CALL**
- II. Motion: CHANGES TO AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
- IV. COMMUNICATIONS**
- V. REPORTS/ACTION ITEMS**

Chair: Election of 99/00 Faculty Senate Executive Committee (attached)

Code Committee:

Motion: "The Faculty Senate Accepts the principle of proration of faculty salaries on the basis of enrollment for summer session, 1999. It directs the Senate Code Committee to prepare a code amendment inserting the right of the administration to devise such prorating policies as a permanent feature of summer school."

Questions:

-School-by-school what was the frequency of prorating on the basis of enrollment during the last two years?

-What was the average percentage of proration of individuals' salaries school-by-school during the last two summer sessions?

-If we had not experienced proration on the basis of enrollment during the last summer session, would we have been able to offer all the classes that we did? How would the absence of proration on the basis of enrollment during the last summer session have eaten up all the profits earned or would the university still have experienced a profit? If so, at what level would profits have resided school-by-school?

-To what extent have program considerations been included in the proposed prorations?

-To what extent has summer teaching faculty collaborated with the administration in the design of the proration policies that are being proposed by the administration?

-How, in general terms, did the university, the colleges/schools, departments spend the distributed profits from summer school after the last two summer sessions?

-When would a faculty member know whether or not he/she would experience proration on the basis of enrollment? At the time of summer school registration? On the first day of class? At the end of the summer ad/drop period?

The provost did not submit written answers to these questions for inclusion in the agenda. He will respond during his presentation at the senate meeting

Curriculum Committee:

Motion: To revise the Mission Statement and Learning Objectives of the General Education Program at Central Washington University (attached)

VI. REPORTS/DISCUSSION ITEMS

- 1. CHAIR (10 min.)**
- 2. CHAIR ELECT (10 min.)**
- 3. PRESIDENT (10 min.)**
- 4. SENATE CONCERNS (10 min.)**
- 5. STUDENT REPORT (10 min.)**
- 6. SENATE COMMITTEES (35 min.)**

Academic Affairs Committee: Charles McGehee

Budget Committee: Barney Erickson

Code Committee: Beverly Heckart

Curriculum Committee: Luetta Monson

Personnel Committee: Robert Perkins

Public Affairs Committee: Linda Beath

VII. NEW BUSINESS

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

IX. ADJOURNMENT

*****NEXT REGULAR SENATE MEETING: April 14, 1999***
BARGE 412**

1999-00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

POSITIONS:

Chair Elect:

Secretary:

2 At-Large Members:

Chair: Linda Beath

Past Chair: John Alsoszatai-Petheo

NOMINEES:

Terry DeVietti, Psychology

Lynn Richmond, Business Administration

Ken Gamon, Mathematics

**MISSION STATEMENT AND LEARNING OBJECTIVES
OF THE
GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM
AT
CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**

The university is devoted to helping students become aware of the wide range and variety and interconnectedness of human knowledge. Students will pursue courses that encompass the arts and humanities, natural sciences and mathematics and the social and behavioral sciences. These courses foster the development of a critical awareness of the content and methods of inquiry in these broad areas of study.

To these ends our general education program holds our students responsible for a high level of competency in the basic skills of reading, writing, speaking and reasoning; and exposes them to a broad sampling of the range of human knowledge and ways of knowing. It attempts to instill a critical awareness of human knowledge and of its relationship to the human condition.

OUTCOMES FOR GENERAL EDUCATION

Students will be able to:

10. Demonstrate a basic competency in critical reasoning, reading, writing, and communication.
2. Develop an awareness of the breadth and depth of human knowledge, scientific, humanistic and artistic.
3. Foster a sense of interconnectedness of knowledge.
4. Become aware of the ways in which knowledge is discovered and created.
5. Develop a sense of the ways in which knowledge must and does evolve.

BASIC SKILLS

Writing

Students will be able to write clear expository prose for a variety of audiences and to assess the reasonableness and rhetorical effectiveness of print and non-print texts. - Page 3

Speaking

Students will be able to speak effectively in a variety of settings and to understand the communication process and its impact on society. - Page 4

Critical Reasoning

Students will be able to use a system of logic or reasoning, and to discuss its applications and its limitations. - Page 4

University 100

Students will develop the skills necessary to successfully navigate a college career. - Page 5

Computer Proficiency

Students will be able to use the computer as a research, writing and computational tool. - Page 6

Foreign Language

Students will be able to demonstrate basic proficiency in a foreign language and knowledge of the culture of at least one country in which the target language is spoken. - Page 7

BREADTH REQUIREMENTS - THE NATURAL SCIENCES

Students will explore the natural world, and demonstrate an appreciation and an understanding of its

complexity. - Page 7

BREADTH REQUIREMENTS - SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

Students will demonstrate knowledge of human cultures and societies in global perspective and understanding of the methods used to study social, economic and political processes in various contexts. - Page 7

BREADTH REQUIREMENTS - ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Students will develop an appreciation for human thought and expression through the arts and philosophy. - Page 8

GOALS AND LEARNING OBJECTIVES

BASIC SKILLS - WRITING

Students will be able to:

Evaluations

1. Identify assumptions and criteria used for judgments in the writing of others.
2. Evaluate all significant assertions and/or manner of expressing the assertions in the writing of others.
3. Write evaluations or critiques of source material which summarizes accurately all passages used, identify and analyze assumptions, evaluate assertions, discuss credibility, respond to the ideas, and justify the response.

Analytical Synthesis

1. Perceive and relate various perspectives on a question at issue and formulate generalizations about those relationships.
2. Write analytical synthesis which draw upon multiple sources, identify logical relationships and varying perspectives among the sources, and arrive at independent conclusions in response to a question at issue.
3. Use at least one style of citation and documentation and describe its appropriate application.

Position Papers

1. Identify the logical progression of arguments, both in your own writing and that of others.
2. Demonstrate a familiarity with how style influences meaning by making effective choices of word order, sentence pattern, arrangement of material, and use of conventions.
3. Write focused position papers which:
 - a. Address a question at issue.
 - b. Develop a focused assertion based on a shared assumption.
 - c. Present evidence, documented when necessary, in support of the line of reasoning.
4. Use a variety of appeals while avoiding rhetorical fallacies.
5. Integrate and address divergent views in ways that show an awareness of audience.

Writing Qualities:

Write expository prose with the following characteristics according to the evaluation criteria used in the course:

1. Purpose indicates clear relationship between writer, subject, and audience.
2. Development specific, credible and purposeful.
3. Arrangement supports paper's purpose

4. Sentences clear, correct, concise and varied.
5. Conventions of standard academic English used consistently.
6. Tone demonstrates an awareness of effective audience engagement.

BASIC SKILLS -SPEAKING

Effective Communication.

Competent communicators demonstrate knowledge and understanding of:

1. The influence of the individual, relationship, and situation on communication.
2. The role of communication in creating meaning, influencing thought, and making decisions.
3. Evaluate communication styles, strategies, and content based on their aesthetic and functional worth.
4. Show sensitivity to the ethical issues associated with communication in a democratic society.

Speaking

Competent speakers demonstrate:

1. Knowledge and understanding of the speaking process.
2. The ability to adapt communication strategies appropriately and effectively according to the needs of the situation and setting.
3. The ability to use language that clarifies, persuades, and/or inspires while respecting differences in listeners' backgrounds.
4. The ability to manage or overcome communication anxiety

BASIC SKILLS - CRITICAL REASONING

Critical reasoning courses are "critical" in the sense that the reasoning they cultivate entails reflective evaluation based upon rigorously established rational criteria. The "reasoning" addressed in Critical Reasoning courses refers not only to solving problems, but also to examining the basic principles of reasoning itself, drawing attention to the formal, systematic, and rational characteristics of thinking. In these courses, students develop the ability to analyze formal and informal arguments, distinguish deductive from inductive arguments, recognize the formal and informal fallacies of thought and language, distinguish between the form and content of an argument (validity and soundness), and recognize the basic elements of reasoning (rules of inference).

In short, Critical Reasoning courses provide students with a set of tools necessary for living an examined life.

Objectives for Critical Reasoning

The student will be able to:

1. Exhibit mastery of the symbolic notation, language, and operations of a formal logic system.
2. Construct solutions to problems in the given system.
3. Apply the most appropriate problem-solving techniques in the given system for the problem at hand.
4. Demonstrate the importance and utility of the given system.
5. Use the formal system to evaluate arguments in human language.
6. Recognize the limitations of the formal system, specifically with respect to problems arising in natural language.

BASIC SKILLS -UNIVERSITY 100

The following are the course objectives that all students will be expected to have accomplished upon completion of this course:

1. Describe and use effective classroom etiquette and college survival skills examples include study skills, time management etc.;
2. Discuss academic life and University sponsored activities in general, including such things as the

meaning of a university education, faculty expectations, student responsibilities and rights, and how to become more involved in the academic community,

3. Discuss and use the library and its resources;
4. Describe General Education and University requirements;
5. Discuss and describe resources for academic advising and career planning;
6. Describe and discuss the academic advising process;
7. Prepare a written, personal, first-year academic plan.

BASIC SKILLS -COMPUTER PROFICIENCY

To pass the computer proficiency exam the student must be able to:

1. Identify and explain the function of the basic components of a computer;
2. Explain the difference between software and hardware.
3. Perform the basic operating system functions:
 - a. Format a disk.
 - b. Copy files to and from a floppy disk.
 - c. Create directories in a logical fashion.
 - d. Delete files.
 - e. Print a file.
4. Perform basic spreadsheet operations:
 - a. Create a spreadsheet.
 - b. Add labels.
 - c. Simple functions using arithmetic operator
 - d. Generate graphs.
5. Perform basic word processing operations:
 - a. Create a document.
 - b. Select fonts.
 - c. Set margins
 - d. Activate the spelling checker.
 - e. Print a document.
6. Access the library's on-line catalog.
7. Perform basic Internet operations:
 - a. E-mail
 - i. Send a message.
 - ii. Send a file.
 - iii. Read a message.
 - iv. Extract and save a message as a file.
 - b. Discussion lists
 - i. Join a list.
 - ii. Communicate with a list.
 - c. Read a Usenet article.
 - d. World Wide Web
 - i. Understand the form of Uniform Resource Locators.
 1. http
 2. ftp
 3. telnet
 4. news
 5. gopher
 - ii. Use a Web browser
8. Understand ethical and legal issues:
 - a. Privacy. Electronic Communications Privacy Act of 1986.
 - b. Offensive messages.

- c. Intellectual property.
- d. Security

BASIC SKILLS - FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Students should be able to:

1. Converse in a foreign language on a basic level.
2. Write basic compositions in the target language.
3. Translate selected basic foreign language texts.
4. Summarize the main ideas of a lecture conducted in the target language.
5. Demonstrate knowledge of the contemporary culture of at least one country in which the target language is spoken.

BREADTH REQUIREMENTS - THE NATURAL SCIENCES

Students will be able to:

- X. Demonstrate an appreciation of the natural worlds, and understand how natural science discovery and research contribute to our lives.
- XI. Rigorously analyze, describe, and comprehend the processes, components, and interrelationships of the natural world.
- 3. Understand and apply the scientific method to natural science problem solving.
- 4. Recognize the natural sciences as a system in which observations and measurements must ultimately verify theories that explain and predict natural phenomena.
- 5. Distinguish between data and interpretation.
- 6. Understand the role and limitations of qualitative analysis.
- 7. Recognize mathematics and quantitative skills as fundamental problem solving tools in the natural sciences.

BREADTH REQUIREMENTS - SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

Students will be able to:

1. Distinguish between data and interpretation.
2. Show the influence of the past on the present.
3. Understand the individual's relationship to the community and political system.
4. Understand the individual's relationships with other individuals within families and other social groups.
5. Discuss the values and ethical assumptions underlying social, political and economic organizations.
6. Analyze methods of inquiry appropriate to the study of human behavior.
7. Understand those patterns of thought, feeling, and behavior which distinguish particular cultures.
8. Understand the social, economic and political processes, issues and events of the United States and the world as a context for informed decision-making and citizenship.
9. Demonstrate knowledge of human cultures in a global perspective, including their diversity and similarity, and apply this knowledge to local, national and international issues.

BREADTH REQUIREMENTS - ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Students will be able to:

1. Discuss the problematic character of distinguishing between fact and value.
2. Examine and discuss historical and cultural differences and how these differences affect human behavior.
3. Explore comparative and cross-cultural perspectives.
4. Demonstrate a knowledge of major works and traditions that have shaped our world.
5. Understand the cultural, historical and personal context and framework for literature, and artistic

works.

6. Critically analyze creative works from the viewpoints of form, style and meaning.
7. Demonstrate the ability to make informed, sensitive aesthetic responses.
8. Understand and appreciate the aesthetic experience.
9. Demonstrate an understanding of human experiences and the ability to relate them to the present.

ROLL CALL 1998-99

FACULTY SENATE MEETING: 4/14/99

ADAMSON, Karen

ALSOZATAI-PETHEO, John

BAXTER, Louise

BEAGHAN, Jim

BENSON, William

BLACKETT, Robert

BRAUNSTEIN, Michael

BRODERSON, Bret

BULLOCK, John

COCHEBA, Don

D'ACQUISTO, Leo

DeVIETTI, Terry

ELY, Lisa

EMMANS, Cindy

FORDAN, Robert

GAMON, Ken

GRAY, Loretta

GUNN, Gerald

HAWKINS, Jim

HOOD, Webster

KAMINSKI, Walter

LEWIS, Keith

MICHEL, John

MONSON, Luetta

MUSTAIN, Wendy

NELSON, Joshua

NGALAMULUME, Kalala

OWENS, Patrick

PRIGGE, Debra

RICHMOND, Lynn

SALCEDO, Bill

SCHAEFER, Todd

SCHWING, James

SOLIZ, Jean

SPENCER, Andrew

STACY, Gerald

THYFAULT, Alberta

UBELACKER, Morris

WILLIAMS, Wendy

WILSON, Blaine

WYATT, Marla

HOLTFRETER, Robert

HACKENBERGER, Steven

RAUBESON, Linda

vacant

DUGAN, Jack

PALMQUIST, Bruce

KURTZ, Martha

GHOSH, Koushik

COLLINS, James

GAZIS, Carey

BEATH, Linda

GARRETT, Roger

HARPER, James

POWELL, Joe

FAIRBURN, Wayne

VASEK, Cheri

BURKHOLDER, Peter

HOLDEN, Lad

BACH, Glen

GAUSE, Tom

WOODCOCK, Don

JEFFERIES, Stephen

LEFKOWITZ, Natalie

HECKART, Beverly

CANNCASCIATO, Daniel

CAPLES, Minerva

BRADLEY, James

WIRTH, Rex

DONAHUE, Barry

OLIVERO, Michael

SNEDEKER, Jeff

ABDALLA, Laila

MADLEY, Susan

ALWIN, John

WEYANDT, Lisa

BERTELSON, Cathy

SCHACTLER, Carolyn

#1 N = 9 A = 13 abs = 6

#2 N = 16 A = 13 abs = 6

Date: March 3, 1999

VISITOR SIGN-IN SHEET

Josh Kilen
 Jack McKay CEAS
 Barbara Radke
 Roy Savioian SBE
 Minnie Roy Blue
 Warren Street COTS
 John Ninkiemann COTS

Please sign your name and return sheet to Faculty Senate secretary directly after the meeting.

Thank you.



CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Office of the Dean • School of Business & Economics

MEMORANDUM

March 1, 1999

TO: Linda Beath (Dept. of Curriculum & Supervision)
Liahna Babener (College of Arts & Humanities)
David Dauwalder (Provost)
Terry DeVietti (Dept. of Psychology)
Ruthi Erdman (Dept. of English)

FROM: Roy Savoian *Roy*

SUBJ: University Forum—Core Values: The Next Step

At the last meeting of the University Forum on February 23, we further developed the list of CWU Core Values. The next iteration is attached for your information and review. Ruthi will develop a revision draft(s) with proper syntax and grammar as well as parallel structure. We can discuss the final draft and Dave's e-mail memo (February 24, 1999) at our next meeting on March 9.

Attachment

c: John Alsoszatai-Petheo (Faculty Senate)
Nancy Bradshaw (University Forum Secretary)
Ivory Nelson (President)

DRAFT

CORE VALUES

Central Washington University

The Core Values enumerated herein represent essential and enduring tenets of CWU. They are so fundamental and deeply held that they seldom change, if ever. This quality of “timelessness” engenders a small set of guiding principles and ideals that are internal to the institution and independent of the external environment. They define who we are and what we stand for. We must be ever vigilant to ensure that CWU’s Core Values serve as a screen through which major decisions are passed and a test of how we conduct ourselves.

- The students’ highest good ^{is} ~~as~~ our paramount concern
- Build student expertise through exploration and application, based on a liberal arts and sciences foundation
- Dedication to quality teaching, with faculty as primary arbiters of the curriculum
- Create a climate of intellectual openness, inquiry and sharing of ideas
- Foster a lifelong aspiration for knowledge; developing a capacity to attain knowledge
- Stewardship by everyone of academic, human, physical and fiscal resources
- Community that is both supportive and challenging
- Nurture a recognition of and respect for the diversity of the world

DRAFT

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139-4307



DEPARTMENT OF EARTH, ATMOSPHERIC, AND PLANETARY SCIENCES

February 11, 1999

RECEIVED
FEB 23 1999
CWU FACULTY SENATE

Dr. Ivory V. Nelson
President
Central Washington University
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

Dear President Nelson,

I have been made aware that some figures regarding my salary for last year have been widely circulated, without explanation that much (38%) of my 1998 salary came from external sources for effort beyond my usual academic year teaching and chair responsibilities. Only 62% of the reported figure were state monies, and that includes chair remuneration. In hopes of dispelling possible speculation that could lead to divisiveness among faculty, I feel that the following comments need to be made available to anyone who receives the salary information to set these numbers in perspective.

I worked full-time for all the summer months on a variety of NSF, NASA and USGS grants, in addition to working overtime on weekends and through the spring holiday during the academic year. I was paid from external grant sources for much of the summer effort, at the rate of my academic-year state-funded step salary.

I am currently on sabbatical in Boston, one of the highest cost of living areas in the U.S. The faculty code specifically encourages faculty to augment their 75% state-supported sabbatical to 135% through external funding. I was awarded the National Science Foundation Visiting Research Professorship through a national competition under the POWRE program (Professional Opportunities for Women in Research and Education). Only five such awards were granted to Earth Scientists nationally in the competition I entered. I am very proud of this award. In conformance with the faculty code, I have used it to make the proposed sabbatical possible, despite disparity in academic salaries between Boston and Ellensburg.

Due to these circumstances, I have earned well more than my state-funded step-based salary, which is mid-range for my rank (23) and in sequence for seniority in my department. Without explanation, the total amount of my salary under these unusual circumstances could be readily misconstrued and could be used to inappropriately to cover up or disregard the real and painful problems of compression and inequity that exist at CWU.

I believe that, in good faith, the faculty and university will continue to value the student learning opportunities and vitality which externally funded research projects bring to the university, and to recognize the personal costs and effort incurred by this work. Out-of-context reporting of top salaries is very dangerous. Appropriate augmentation of summer and sabbatical salaries from non-state sources for grant work should in no way overshadow the difficult challenges and grim realities that we face in understanding and achieving appropriate remuneration for all faculty. This would be a very sorry use of numerical data indeed.

Respectfully,

Dr. M. Meghan Miller
Professor of Geology, CWU
NSF Visiting Research Professor, MIT

- C: ☒ Faculty Senate
L. Ely, Chair, Geology
J. Ninneman, Dean, College of the Sciences
D. Perry, Dean of Graduate Studies and Research
D. Dauwalder, Provost
Board of Trustees



CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Department of English

February 25, 1999

Professor John Alsoszatai-Petheo,
Faculty Senate Chair
Faculty Senate Office
Barge Hall 409--MS 7509

RECEIVED
MAR 01 1999
CWU FACULTY SENATE

Dear Professor Alsoszatai-Petheo:

Like many today, I suspect, I barely had time to savor the good news that Nelson is leaving before experiencing a sense of *déjà vu*. In my more than thirty years at Central I've seen more botched, badly conducted, and disastrous "searches" than I care to recall. One of the worst was the search that gave us Ivory Nelson! I well remember hearing the disturbing information about Nelson's failure as president of the Texas community college. Yet we got him in spite of the clear evidence that we were making a serious mistake.

I don't want to see another search dominated by a Board of Trustees, especially our present trustees who have identified themselves with Nelson and his policies and have, as we all know, closed their ears and their minds to faculty concerns and needs. How can anyone believe Ms. Chaplin and her cohorts will work with faculty in recruiting a new president? If they are in charge it will be just another instance of top-down management.

I strongly urge the Senate, in the name of the faculty, to assume responsibility for the search process. I believe it should be conducted by a committee of faculty which will be truly representative. The search committee should include emeriti, senior professors, junior professors (including untenured junior faculty), and part-time and adjunct faculty--the full range of Central's teaching faculty. No deans, no provost, no vice-presidents. No Pappas or any of his ilk. No administrators!

It is time for the faculty at Central to assert itself and take the lead in selecting a genuine academic leader and not another educational CEO for university president. We need someone who understands academic issues and is able to talk with faculty about them, who has the stature and the skills to represent Central off campus, who will clean up the budget scandal and will be receptive to budgetary priorities that put teaching, scholarship and academic support before all else, who will recognize the need to save the library from the slow death it is undergoing, and who will drastically downsize the administration. Additionally, I think the faculty has a right and more than enough cause to ask the trustees to resign, but short of that they should be asked to

recuse themselves and leave the entire search and hiring process, except for their pro forma ratification of the faculty choice, to the faculty!

No one "leader on a white horse" will be able to transform Central from what it is to what it might have been if we had not had to suffer the presidencies of Garrity and Nelson, but if the faculty is willing to take seriously its role in governing the university there is a chance, at least a chance, in spite of everything to the contrary, including the present Board of Trustees, that Central will, like Lazarus, rise from the dead.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "T. Blanton".

Thomas L. Blanton

Emeritus Professor of English

Date sent: **Wed, 03 Mar 1999 14:17:45 -0800 (PST)**
From: **"John A. Alsoszatai-Petheo" <japetheo@CWU.EDU>**
Subject: **Something to think about**
To: **senate@cwu.EDU**

>Date: Sun, 28 Feb 1999 15:21:15 -0700
>From: hedgerow@ellensburg.com (John Ressler)
>Subject: Something to think about
>X-Sender: hedgerow@mail.ellensburg.com
>To: japetheo@cwu.EDU
>Cc: morris@cwu.EDU, hackenbe@cwu.EDU
>MIME-version: 1.0

>
>Dear John,
>I would appreciate it if you could pass this on to the Department Chairs at
>Central. The content is self-explanatory and not offered in jest or
>fatuousness. At the same time, I recognize that it is a bit heretical and
>would be tough to pull off, but the payoffs to the faculty and the
>university could be substantial.

>
>_____

>As a retiree I shouldn't care a whit about what goes on at CWU anymore but
>I had enough really good years there that I have a soft spot (heart or
>head, your call) for the place. Having been away from the day to day
>chicanery and complaint for a couple years now some things have clarified
>themselves. I just read and heard that Pres. Nelson intends to step down
>sometime next year. This is no cause for jubilation, but it perhaps offers
>a chance to rethink collectively what the university is, and ought to be,
>about. Toward that end, think about this:

>Before a presidential search committee is constituted, I'd like to float a
>proposal that might bring Central into alignment with the realities of the
>contemporary university milieu. Has it ever occurred to anyone that perhaps
>the title and the position of "President" is outmoded? Does an institution
>like Central really need a president except to give the Board of Trustees
>someone to order around? The University of Bologna got along very nicely
>for nearly 400 years with no administrators at all, and certainly no board
>of trustees.

>Think about it--if a president takes the job seriously and tries to trace a
>path of reason through the minefield of competing demands, he or she is
>very quickly stretched on a bureaucratic rack headed for madness or

>withdrawal. We've seen it happen. If he or she hands off tasks and
 >decisions to underlings, coordination of policy--no matter how finely
 >crafted philosophically--becomes next to impossible. A president must wear,
 >comfortably, at least three different hats at once: Leader of the
 >university, Point guard against the caprices of the state's bureaucracy,
 >and Public relations maven. We haven't had anyone in the job for at least
 >fifteen years who could do that.
 >Furthermore, for some reason universities have always leaned to tripartite
 >divisions of reality: teaching, research, public service; letters, arts,
 >sciences; assistant, associate, full; and you can think of many others.
 >Things that come in threes are comfortable for us.
 >So why not eliminate the position of president entirely. Think of the money
 >saved! Presidents don't come cheap--and then we seldom think we've gotten
 >what's being paid for. Why not replace the position with a triumvirate?
 >Each of the triumvirs could be paid about what a current vice-president
 >makes, and since there is no president, there can be no _vice_ presidents
 >anyway, right? More savings. As a practical matter, one of the three
 >members could deal with matters of consequence to faculty, staff, and
 >students. The second would deal with things of consequence to the HEC
 >Board, legislature, and governor, and the third with public relations,
 >fund-raising, and "outreach." Decisions on most of these matters would have
 >to be made collectively and after consultation with everyone affected.
 >Each triumvirate member could/should have one to three Technical Assistants
 >to help with the banal administrative and record-keeping task of his or her
 >area. These T.A.'s would not be used as human shields! They needn't be
 >retreaded profs, nor would they replace deans. Keep the deans. You have
 >good deans, but they should be buffers against any bureaucratic excesses of
 >the folks on the top floor.
 >Each year, depending on an annual contingency/exigency forecast (or a
 >simple rotation of the position), one member could be elected Primus inter
 >pares for the year through a poll of the faculty and civil service
 >department heads. The c/e forecast is already a part of the strategic plan
 >(the Prez calls them "assumptions") but it needs to be recognized as
 >nothing more than an educated guess arrived at by committee.
 >The suggested reorganization should have the net effect of reducing the
 >administrative overburden of the university, and saving a good deal of
 >money in the process. And, without all those vice-presidents, Central would
 >look a lot less like a fly-by-night loan company. Furthermore, if you all
 >decide a few years down the line that you can't live without a president,
 >you have gotten a pretty good look at three potential candidates. There

>wouldn't be too many surprises left. And changing back to single leader
>would take no more than a plebiscite and few strokes of a pen.
>In searching for the right mix of people for the triumvirate it seems to me
>that you'd want people who have a demonstrated record of success in a
>collaborative environment. In fact, as academics, they ought to have done
>extensive team teaching. It wouldn't hurt if they had degrees in more than
>one discipline as well. They need to have breadth in addition to depth.
>They should each have a demonstrated record as an adept flakcatcher,
>because these kinds of jobs today unavoidably entail more of that than any
>other, creative, activity.
>
>Where is it written that a university has to follow the corporate model?
>Why does a University have to have a CEO. Hell, most of the CEOs out there
>are overpaid and underworked--the rewards of BS-ing their way to the top of
>some corporate heap. Comes the revolution, they'll go the way of the
>dinosaurs. Get ahead of the curve, dispense with top-down, dictatorial
>"leadership" and move to a more democratic, more cooperative, more
>consultative structure.
>
>Another benefit--at which not to sneeze--is that with no president, there'd
>be no one living in the president's house, which is need of remodelling
>anyway. Turn it into a Faculty/Staff Club! It would be the perfect size and
>location. Can you think of a better way to get faculty talking across
>disciplines and improving morale? (That is a concern these days, is it
>not?)
>
>Sure there would be some details to work out such as who would run the
>business office and the physical plant, but on the academic side of things
>there is a whole lot more room for creative thought on the subject of how
>the university is organized. The BOT will be an obstacle but their stake in
>and knowledge of the REAL workings of a university is limited, and they are
>political appointees, and perhaps need to be reminded of that occasionally.
>Think outside the box...think outside the BOT.
>
>One more thing--don't e-mail me any replies because we're leaving our
>winter nest in the desert on Monday and will be traveling without access to
>e-mail for the next three months. And I am not a candidate. Retirement is
>too much fun to give up, and my plate is already heaped.
>
>Respectfully submitted,

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CODE CMTE. MOTION

ORIGINAL Motion: "The Faculty Senate Accepts the principle of proration of faculty salaries on the basis of enrollment for summer session, 1999. It directs the Senate Code Committee to prepare a code amendment inserting the right of the administration to devise such prorationing policies as a permanent feature of summer school."

PROPOSED AMENDMENT/CHANGE:

STRIKE "inserting..." to "...summer school." and replace with:

"requiring the Administration to prepare a (biennial) proration plan for summer school to be submitted to the Faculty Senate for approval before it can be implemented."

THEREFORE, new motion would read:

"The Faculty Senate Accepts the principle of proration of faculty salaries on the basis of enrollment for summer session, 1999. It directs the Senate Code Committee to prepare a code amendment requiring the Administration to prepare a (biennial) proration plan for summer school to be submitted to the Faculty Senate for approval before it can be implemented."

RATIONALE: This would give the administration the responsibility and flexibility to create appropriate proration policies as needed, but would not permanently or unduly sacrifice faculty input over working conditions and compensation in summer school.

College of Education and Professional Studies
Central Washington University

To: Members of the Faculty Senate
RE: Summer School Proration Questions
From: Dr. Lin Douglas and Dr. Jack McKay

1 - 2. Frequency of proration on the basis of enrollment during the last two years:

Summer	Courses Scheduled	Courses-Workshops Canceled	Percentage
Summer session 1997	390 in 29 programs	16*	4.1%
Summer session 1998	386 in 29 programs	14*	3.6%

*Some canceled courses were assigned to adjunct faculty.

Decisions on planning and modifying the summer school programs are based on policies and practices established 1992, and updates as needed. These policies and practices were established by the members of the Dean's Cabinet (see attached policy #99.7).

3. Impact of a non-proration policy on summer session profits:
 - a. A policy on non-proration would have a "chilling" effect on the creativity and risk taking when planning summer school offerings.
 - b. Historically, marginal enrollment courses would not be offered. These courses would likely be only offered during the academic year, thereby impacting state supported FTEs.
4. Program considerations when developing the summer session schedule:
 - a. Historically, program offerings are taken into consideration in order to avoid singletons and duplications of course.
 - b. Where a program was in a phase of redesign, one low enrollment courses was approved, but no proration was instituted.
5. Degree of collaboration in the development of the summer session schedule:
 - a. Chairs solicit information about courses and workshops that are desired for the summer.
 - b. Chairs design a tentative schedule based on faculty suggestions, past enrollment figures, and feedback from graduates and K-12 practitioners.
 - c. Faculty are involved in a review of the summer school offerings before submitted for final catalog printing.
6. Distribution of summer session profits:
 - a. Funds are prorated, based on summer enrollment, to each department for the purposes of faculty travel and development, purchase of instructional equipment, support for the design of workshops and other creative endeavors.
 - b. Based on a distribution formula, some summer school profits are allocated by the dean to offset college wide projects (guest speakers, faculty and staff development, equipment maintenance).
7. Communication about proration information:
 - a. Communication about the possibility of proration (although not done the past summer) would take place once enrollment figures are known.
 - b. The chair and the faculty member would discuss alternatives to how the course could be maintained, with canceling the course as the last option.
8. Additional consideration and implications of a restrictive policy for summer school salaries:
 - a. With a campus wide "no cut" policy, there would be little incentive to schedule "start-up" courses or host special interest workshops.
 - b. With a campus wide policy on a "no cut" policy, there is little incentive for departments or individual faculty to promote and recruit students.
 - c. There is little or no support in the College of Education and Professional Studies for a uniform proration policy that would apply to all colleges/school/ that would reduce the abilities to meet unique and diverse needs of students.

SUMMER SESSION POLICY

Policy Statement: Flexibility is essential to operate a successful summer program that rewards faculty and provide educational opportunities for students.

Process: The following policies will guide decision-making during summer session.

Thesis Pay for Summer Quarter

1. The maximum funding, per committee, is \$500. Each department has the flexibility for distribution to committee members. Total thesis pay, per faculty member, will not exceed \$2,000.

Proration Process for Summer Session Courses

1. Review the overall profit status for department, program, and division with the intent of not penalizing faculty.
2. Look at the total enrollment load for the individual faculty member.
3. Take into account independent studies or arranged courses for the faculty member.
4. Recognize the obligation to students and faculty—What are the “negatives” associated with canceling a course?
5. If the overall enrollments for all courses are low, provide the option of proration to the faculty member. If overall enrollments are within or approach the class-size guidelines and the department/program is showing a profit, no proration occurs.

To reduce the likelihood proration becoming an issue, chairs:

1. Schedule courses that have been successful in previous years, and
2. Acknowledge department faculty commitment to the support of given department majors or programs during summer session, and
3. Identify potential “money losers” in advance and seek faculty agreement, in advance, about what will happen if course enrollments are low (i.e., experimental courses, starting new program)

Adopted 3/6/97

Reviewed February 17, 1999

To Be Reviewed Spring 2000



CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

ELLENSBURG • LYNNWOOD • MOSES LAKE • SEATAC • STEILACOOM • WENATCHEE • YAKIMA

MEMORANDUM

March 2, 1999

To: Faculty Senate

From: Roy Savoian and John Lasik, School of Business and Economics

Copies: David Dauwalder, Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs

Subject: SBE Responses to Faculty Senate Summer Session Questions

The following are the School of Business and Economics' responses to the questions posed by the Faculty Senate at its February 15, 1999, meeting.

1. School-by-school, what was the frequency of prorating on the basis of enrollment during the last two years?

No summer school salaries have been prorated within the SBE during the last two years. Overall, the SBE surpassed breakeven, so the published schedule of classes proceeded. Not all departments at all sites were profitable; however, the SBE's proration policy led to excess revenues from one department being applied to shortfalls in other departments.

2. What was the average percentage of proration of individuals' salaries school-by-school during the last two summer sessions?

Not applicable in the SBE, since proration has not occurred.

3. If we had not experienced proration on the basis of enrollment during the last summer session, would we have been able to offer all the classes that we did? How would the absence of proration on the basis of enrollment during the last summer session have eaten up all the profits earned or would the university still have experienced a profit? If so, at what level would profits have resided school-by-school?

Not applicable in the SBE, since proration did not occur last summer.

4. To what extent have program considerations been included in the proposed prorations?

Program considerations in terms of student needs are central to building the summer school schedule. In addition, SBE chairs and program directors coordinate across departments to eliminate scheduling conflicts. In the SBE, the success of one department depends, in part, on the success of the other departments.

5. To what extent has summer teaching faculty collaborated with the administration in the design of the proration policies that are being proposed by the administration?

Extensive collaboration exists in the SBE. Prompted by a shift in the summer school funding base from state support to self-support, SBE faculty collaborated with SBE administrators to create a proration policy. After extensive discussions at the department level, the SBE full faculty voted to approve the original proration policy. Subsequently, the SBE Faculty Policy Committee, a standing committee whose members are elected by the SBE full faculty, reviewed the original policy and recommended minor changes. These changes were approved by the SBE Dean during Spring Quarter, 1997.

6. How, in general terms, did the university, the colleges/schools, departments spend the distributed profits from summer school after the last two summer sessions?

Most of the excess revenues returned to the SBE were used to fund a summer research grant administered internally in the SBE. All SBE faculty were eligible to apply for this competitive program.

7. When would a faculty member know whether or not he/she would experience proration on the basis of enrollment? At the time of summer school registration? On the first day of class? At the end of the summer add/drop period?

In accordance with its policy, the SBE delays final decisions regarding proration to the end of the summer add/drop period.



COTS Memo

To: Faculty Senate
CC: Provost Dauwalder, Deans Babener, Douglas, and Savoian
From: John Ninnemann and Warren Street, College of the Sciences
Date: March 2, 1999
Re: Summer Session Policy Responses

The following are the College of the Sciences' responses to the questions of the Faculty Senate in preparation for its March 3, 1999 consideration of summer session proration policies.

Items 1 and 2: Frequency of prorating on the basis of enrollment and percentage of salary paid in prorated courses:

Pertinent data may be found in the table below. The average enrollment in prorated and full salary courses and the number of courses canceled for low enrollment are also given.

	1997	1998
Number of Prorated Classes	8	11
Number of Full Salary Classes	103	91
Average % of salary earned in prorated courses	51.90%	49.90%
Average enrollment, prorated classes	6.75	6.91
Average enrollment, full salary classes	17.26	15.56
Number of Canceled Classes*	10	5

*Does not include cancellations at instructor's request or departmental request.

Item 3: Effects of no proration on class offerings and profits:

This answer is presented in the context of course schedules restrained by the premise that low enrollment courses could be prorated or canceled. Given those schedules, without proration on the basis of enrollment, we would have been able to offer all of our classes if we used excess enrollments in one department to balance low enrollments in another department. Enrollment balancing across departments is contrary to our college policy, however. COTS has many departments, representing disparate disciplines. We recognize that the department is the most immediate academic community for faculty

members and have had a long-standing policy of balancing enrollments only within a department.

We estimate that paying full salaries instead of prorated salaries would have reduced the college's excess revenue share by \$13,739 in 1997 and \$21,699 in 1998, reducing excess revenue from \$93,269 to \$79,530 in 1997 and from \$111,696 to \$89,997 in 1998.

It is more difficult to estimate the effect of maintaining classes that were canceled, since many classes were canceled at the instructor's request, merged with another class, become a team-taught or distance education class, or other relatively benign reason. Canceling courses for low enrollment is not unique to summer session or self-support classes. We estimate that maintaining courses canceled for low enrollments would have cost \$33,068 in 1997 and \$19,741 in 1998, further reducing COTS excess revenue shares to \$46,462 in 1997 and \$70,256 in 1998.

Item 4: Program considerations and proration:

The effects of courses offered and prorations on program integrity are judgments made primarily by a department's faculty and its chair. Since prorations may affect a department's share of excess revenues, and excess revenues support the academic program through faculty development, the choice is between two forms of program support. In any event, there are many instances each summer of marginally enrolled courses being fully supported in service of the academic program. In 1998, for example, about 20 COTS courses with fewer than 12 undergraduate students were fully supported.

Item 5: Faculty involvement in designing proration policies:

The general principles of our proration policy predate the formation of the college and the service of most of its faculty members. Our associate dean's personal files yield a summer session contract from 1979 which asserts the university's right to cancel or prorate his salary for reasons of insufficient enrollment, so a proration policy was in effect at least 20 years ago. Our college's implementation of the policy has been relatively constant over these years. The extent of faculty involvement in drawing up the original policies is not known.

Item 6: Uses for which excess revenues were spent:

COTS departments used their summer revenues primarily for partial reimbursement of professional travel, computer hardware and software, equipment for new faculty, graduate student support, faculty position advertising and interview expenses, supplies, copier charges, instructional travel, telephone charges, and registration for summer workshops. The dean's office retains a portion of summer revenues and uses it to support faculty search and interview expenses. Thus, all summer revenues are spent on academic program expenses. Academic year funds for these purposes are insufficient or nonexistent for most COTS departments, so summer revenues are, unfortunately, an essential source of support.

Item 7: Time at which faculty member is informed of proration:

Our guiding principle is to allow the greatest chance for classes to fill, considering the faculty member's preferences for an early or late decision. In most cases of cancellation for low enrollment, preregistration provides the first evidence that enrollment may be small. This year, preregistration ends on June 4 and conversations with faculty members and department offices about low enrollments will begin at that time. Historically, a final decision has been delayed until the first day or two of classes to see if in-person registration boosts enrollments. Decisions on second term classes might be delayed until the second term begins. Late decisions also are typical for classes taught at east side and west side centers, where students are less likely to preregister.

Comments

As the Senate takes up the matter of proration and cancellation policy, we would like to comment on a few matters.

1. Under self-support conditions, a full time teaching position cannot be guaranteed for every faculty member. If it is our intention not to cancel or prorate courses, we can expect the number of proposed courses to rise and we will need to be very selective in initially choosing our offerings -- much more selective than we are now because we won't have the flexibility to adjust offerings later on. In reality, we will still have cancellations, but they will occur before the courses are ever listed in the summer session catalog.

The Senate might address the question of how to equitably choose course offerings for the summer. Program need with no consideration of enrollment? Equal number of credits for all interested faculty members? Historic patterns of enrollment? Seniority of instructor? Low instructor salary? Patterns of student preference among instructors? This question will become more crucial if the proration policy is changed.

A second, related, policy question: If an instructor proposes a class that doesn't meet the criteria, whatever they are, for inclusion in the summer catalog, can the instructor and university agree to list the course under a contract with a proration-cancellation clause?

2. In administering summer session we frequently refer to the Summer Session Policy Manual from the provost's office. The potential for salary reductions based on enrollment is described in this manual. We haven't seen this manual referred to in the Senate's deliberations. In the Senate's view, what is the status of this policy manual?

3. There are variations in how different schools and colleges implement the general proration policy. These variations are due to the different fiscal circumstances of the schools and colleges. For some, summer enrollments are predictable and robust, for others, there is less certainty. For some, academic year budgets for faculty development, travel, and equipment are adequate; for others, these budgets are inadequate and summer revenues are essential. Differences in proration policies are, in part, adaptive responses to these circumstances.

4. If courses are not to be canceled or prorated because of program need and our commitment to students, will instructors or departments be allowed to cancel a course once it is published in the summer session manual?

5. We prorate salaries for reasons of enrollment during the academic year. Examples include the additional pay for teaching a Distance Education section and pay for Continuing Education classes. Will the Senate move to eliminate prorated pay for these courses?

6. If proration is eliminated, excess revenues will be reduced and we will move in the direction of breaking even or losing money in summer session. It would be prudent to determine the measures that will be taken if revenues don't cover the expenses of summer session.

7. If university-wide enrollment balancing is instituted, so that costs and revenues are considered for the institution as a whole, then summer session should be administered from a single office for the entire university, not from the offices of the deans.

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES

SUMMER REVENUE

■ **65 TO 70% is distributed back to Departments for their own initiatives.**

■ **What CAH does with the 30-35% of the revenue that goes to the College:**

1. Fund faculty development: scholarship/creativity grants, travel for full-time and part-time faculty, interdisciplinary teaching projects, summer stipends for faculty, and other development opportunities.

2. Fund Departmental searches for new full-time faculty: advertising, interview costs, on-campus visits by candidates, telephone checks, meals and per diem, and other search expenses.

3. Fund start-up costs for new full-time faculty: computers, software, equipment, office materials, and other professional necessities.

4. Purchase equipment to support teaching and learning in the College (c.f. sewing machines in the Theater Arts Costume Shop; video equipment for the Communication Department; hosting disciplinary events and conferences, etc.).

5. Fund College initiatives that give identity and focus to CAH and promote innovative academic, intellectual, and creative opportunities for students and faculty (c. f. The Holocaust Symposium, *Ventures* [the CAH monthly newsletter on innovative pedagogies], and other programs).

6. Fund campus and student activities for CAH and CWU (c. f. speakers, film festivals, colloquia, guest artists, History Day, academic/artistic events and competitions, student participation, and other events that create the vibrant academic inquiry crucial to the University).



CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

ELLENSBURG • LYNNWOOD • MOSES LAKE • SEATAC • STEILACOOM • WENATCHEE • YAKIMA

FACULTY SENATE

March 4, 1999

Central Washington University Board of Trustees:

Gwen Chaplin
Amy Gillespie
Frederic Glover
Leslie Jones
Mike Sells
Wilfred Woods
Judy Yu

Dear Board Members:

It is my duty to inform you that the Faculty Senate, at its regular meeting of March 3, 1999, adopted the following resolution.

Faculty Senate Resolution (Motion No. 3207):

The Faculty Senate directs John A. Alsoszatai-Petheo, Faculty Senate Chair, to report to the Central Washington University Board of Trustees at its Friday, March 5th, 1999 meeting that the Faculty Senate concurs, and supports the Resolution adopted by the Concerned Faculty of Central which states:

"We, the undersigned faculty of CWU, insist that faculty constitute a majority of the upcoming Presidential search committee. We also insist that faculty representation on the committee be determined by the faculty."

Given that the special meeting of the Board of Trustees has a limited agenda, and given that the Faculty Senate has directed me to communicate their decision to you for your consideration at this meeting, I am submitting the Senate's resolution in written form. Additionally, I also plan to be available to present it to the Board in person on Friday, March 5th, should the Board decide to make the time available to allow me to make such a presentation.

Sincerely,

John A. Alsoszatai-Petheo, Ph.D.
Professor, and Faculty Senate Chair



CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Office of the Provost / Vice President
for Academic Affairs

MEMORANDUM

Date: March 2, 1999

TO: Academic Affairs Council

FROM: David P. Dauwalder, Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs *DP Dauwalder*

COPIES: President's Cabinet, B. Erickson, R. Perkins

SUBJECT: **PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF A PLAN TO ADDRESS ONGOING FACULTY SALARY CONCERNS**
(AKA—FACULTY SALARY MANAGEMENT PLAN)

As part of the analysis of faculty salary issues that has occurred over the past several months the need to regularize some past practices and identify several new practices designed to maximize our ability to maintain a strong faculty salary base have become apparent. The 11 following actions identify potential practices and in some cases policies that we should consider implementing at Central Washington University. Some of these actions, if implemented, can appropriately be implemented through revisions or clarifications of administrative processes. Some of these actions, if implemented, are only appropriately implemented through Faculty Code changes through the Faculty Senate. Not all of these changes may be appropriate; many will be appropriate as stated or as revised through careful consideration by administrators and faculty.

With this memo, I am asking the Academic Affairs Council to review each of the 11 potential actions and prepare a brief report that answers three questions related to each action:

1. *What would be the effect of implementing this action?*
2. *Based on the potential effects, does the Academic Affairs Council recommend implementing this action or implementing an action in a revised form?*
3. *If the council recommends implementation, what process should be followed to implement the action?*

To conduct this analysis, I'm asking for the following consideration to occur:

- That each college/school dean discuss these possible actions with his or her department chairs and bring their input to the April 6, 1999, meeting of the Academic Affairs Council.
- That the Chair of the Faculty Senate request review these possible actions by the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee and the Faculty Senate Budget Committee and bring their input to the April 6, 1999 meeting of the Academic Affairs Council.
- That the Chair of the Academic Department Chairs Organization review these possible actions with ADCO and bring its input to the April 6, 1999, meeting of the Academic Affairs Council.

Following the discussion on April 6, 1999, (and subsequent discussions that may be needed following that meeting) a final document will be prepared by the Academic Affairs Council. That document will present the conclusions drawn and identify specific and appropriate action to be taken to implement changes in practice and policy through the university's regular policy-development processes.

PLAN TO ADDRESS ONGOING FACULTY SALARY CONCERNS

—Eleven Possible Actions to Consider—

(aka—*Faculty Salary Management Plan*)

To be submitted for review by (a) college deans and department chairs, (b) Faculty Senate Personnel Committee, (c) Faculty Senate Budget Committee, and (d) the Academic Department Chairs Organization to provide input for discussion at the April 6, 1999, meeting of the Academic Affairs Council.

Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

- TT-1** To place in university policy the established practice of providing funds for faculty promotions separately from legislatively appropriated salary increases.
- TT-2** To establish by university policy a minimum faculty salary step at which tenure-track faculty with terminal degrees will be placed upon hire.

Merit and Equity

- MEq-1** Faculty Salary Equity increases will be provided from a number of sources, including legislatively appropriated faculty-salary increases.
- MEq-2** To require in university policy that a faculty equity study be conducted every five years and that the results of the regular study should be used to address faculty salary equity issues.
- MEq-3** To require in university policy that anytime the state legislature provides a faculty salary increase that a minimum portion be applied to merit and a minimum portion be applied to equity adjustments. If so, (a) What minimum portion should be identified? and (b) How should that minimum portion be determined?
- MEq-4** To revise the Faculty Code to allow movement of full professors on the faculty salary scale.

Part-Time Faculty

- PT-1** To complete the current four-year process of tying the minimum rate of pay for part-time faculty with terminal degrees in their disciplines to be equal to Step 1 of the faculty salary scale. To maintain the minimum rate equal to Step 1 of the faculty salary scale.
- PT-2** To develop a budget-development plan for academic colleges that specifies the cost of part-time instruction in each college for each academic year prior to July 1.

Faculty Salary Base

- FSB-1** To continue the use of faculty salary savings for part-time faculty hires. However, to establish a university-level guideline that no more than 30 percent of faculty salary savings in any academic year should be used for goods and services, travel, and equipment. The figure will be reported yearly.
- FSB-2** To require in university policy that the university take action yearly to ensure no reduction in the university's faculty salary base in years where the university's operating budget remains the same or increases. To report yearly the increase in faculty salary base.

Fund-Raising

- FR-1** Identify the extent to which external fund raising is currently providing support for faculty through faculty development. Prepare a plan that will identify appropriate functions that should be supported by these funds and prepare a plan to increase external fund raising to address these ongoing and potential needs.

Senate Resolution:

The Faculty Senate directs John A. Alsoszatai-Petheo, Faculty Senate Chair, to report to the Central Washington University Board of Trustees at its Friday, March 5th, 1999 meeting that the Faculty Senate concurs, and supports the Resolution adopted by the Concerned Faculty of Central which states:

"We, the undersigned faculty of CWU, insist that faculty constitute a majority of the upcoming Presidential search committee. We also insist that faculty representation on the committee be determined by faculty."

TALLY

1999-00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITION

#1

#2

Ken Gamon, Mathematics ~~HHH HHH HHH HHH HHH~~ (25)

TOTAL: _____ TOTAL: _____

Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies ~~HHH HHH HHH HHH HHH~~

TOTAL: ~~HHH~~ 1 (26) TOTAL: _____

Nelson HHH HHH HHH HHH (20)
(write-in)

TOTAL: _____ TOTAL: _____

(write-in)

TOTAL: _____ TOTAL: _____

36 ballots

BALLOT

1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☒

Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☐

Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☐

Josh Nelson

Write In

☐

Write In

BALLOT

1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☐

Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☒

Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☒

Joshua Nelson

Write In

☐

Write In

BALLOT

1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☐

Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☒

Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☒

Joshua Nelson

Write In

☐

Write In

BALLOT

1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☒

Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☐

Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☒

Josh Nelson

Write In

☐

Write In

BALLOT

1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☐

Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☒

Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☒

Josh Nelson

Write In

☐

Write In

BALLOT

1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☐

Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☒

Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☒

Joshua Nelson

Write In

☐

Write In

BALLOT
1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☐

Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☒

Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☒

Josh Nelson

Write In

☐

Write In

BALLOT
1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☒

Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☒

Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☐

Write In

☐

Write In

BALLOT
1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☒

Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☐

Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☒

Joshua Nelson

Write In

☐

Write In

BALLOT
1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☒

Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☒

Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☐

Write In

☐

Write In

BALLOT
1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☐ Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☒ Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☒ Joshua Nelson
Write In

☐ _____
Write In

BALLOT
1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☒ Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☒ Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☐ _____
Write In

☐ _____
Write In

BALLOT
1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☒ Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☒ Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☐ Joshua Nelson
Write In

☐ _____
Write In

BALLOT
1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☒ Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☒ Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☐ _____
Write In

☐ _____
Write In

BALLOT

1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☒

Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☒

Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☐

Write In

☐

Write In

BALLOT

1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☒

Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☒

Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☐

Write In

☐

Write In

BALLOT
1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☒

Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☒

Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☐

Write In

☐

Write In

BALLOT
1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☐

Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☒

Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☒

JOSHUA NELSON

Write In

☐

Write In

BALLOT
1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:



Ken Gamon, Mathematics



Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies



Joshua Nelson

Write In



Write In

BALLOT
1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:



Ken Gamon, Mathematics



Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies



Write In



Write In

BALLOT
1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☒

Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☐

Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☒

J. Nelson

Write In

☐

Write In

BALLOT
1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☒

Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☒

Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☐

Joshua Nelson

Write In

☐

Write In

BALLOT

1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☒

Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☐

Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☒

Josh

Write In

☐

Write In

BALLOT

1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☒

Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☒

Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☐

Joshua Nelson

Write In

☐

Write In

BALLOT
1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☒

Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☐

Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☒

Josh Nelson

Write In

☐

Write In

BALLOT
1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☐

Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☒

Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☒

JOSHA NELSON

Write In

☐

Write In

BALLOT
1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☐ Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☒ Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☒ Joshua Nelson
Write In

☐ _____
Write In

BALLOT
1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☒ Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☐ Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☒ Joshua Nelson
Write In

☐ _____
Write In

BALLOT
1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☒

Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☒

Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☐

Write In

☐

Write In

BALLOT
1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☒

Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☐ *Joshua Nelson*

☒

Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☐

Write In

☐

Write In

BALLOT
1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☒

Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☒

Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☐

Joshua Helson

Write In

☐

Write In

BALLOT
1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☒

Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☐

Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☒

JOSHUA NELSON

Write In

☐

Write In

BALLOT
1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☐

Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☒

Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☒

Josh Nelson

Write In

☐

Write In

BALLOT
1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☒

Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☐

Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☒

Josh Nelson

Write In

☐

Write In

BALLOT
1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☐

Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☒

Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☒

Joshua Nelson

Write In

☐

Write In

BALLOT
1999/00 FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
March 3, 1999

AT-LARGE POSITIONS

Mark two boxes:

☒

Ken Gamon, Mathematics

☐

Marla Wyatt, Family & Consumer Studies

☒

JOSHUA NELSON

Write In

☐

Write In